

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FORREST KENDRID,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-1489 SCR P

ORDER AND FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

Plaintiff, a civil detainee proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. §1983. Recent court orders served on plaintiff's address of record were returned by the postal service. (See Docket Notations on July 12, Aug. 14, and Sept. 4, 2024.) It appears that plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 183(b), which requires that a party appearing pro se inform the court of any address change. More than sixty-three days have passed since the first court order was returned by the postal service and plaintiff has failed to notify the court of a current address.

Accordingly, the Clerk of the Court IS HEREBY ORDERED to randomly assign a district judge to this case.

Further, IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. See E.D. Cal. R. 183(b).

///

1           These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge  
2 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within twenty-one days  
3 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections  
4 with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings  
5 and Recommendations.” Any response to the objections shall be filed and served within fourteen  
6 days after service of the objections. Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the  
7 specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951  
8 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

9 DATED: October 2, 2024

10  
11   
12 SEAN C. RIORDAN  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28